REMARKS

Summary of Action

In the subject Final Office Action, the Examiner maintained her rejections, i.e. rejecting

- claims 1, 2, 6-11, 18, 21-22, 25-27, 30-32, 35-37 and 39-41 under 35 USC 102(e) as being fully anticipated by Niemi (USP 6,415,294);

- claims 3-5 under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Rubinstein (USP 5,913,215); and

- claims 12-17, 19-20, 23-24, 28-29, 33-34, 38 and 42 under 35 USC 103 as being unpatentable over Neimi and Finseth (USP 6,271,840 combined).

Summary of Response

In response, Applicant further expanded on the previously presented reasons for patentability, and respectfully urges the Examiner to carefully reconsider Applicant's arguments.

Rejection of claims 1, 2, 6-11, 18, 21-22, 25-27, 30-32, 35-37 and 39-41

In the subject Final Office Action, the Examiner maintained her rejections against claims 1, 2, 6-11, 18, 21-22, 25-27, 30-32, 35-37 and 39-41 under 35 USC 102(e) for being fully anticipated by Niemi (USP 6,415,294). In response, Applicant respectfully directs the Examiner's attention again to the fact that claims 1, 21, 25, 35 and 39 all clearly require

a) the automatically assembled *information source identifiers directly identify the additional information pages* that may be retrieved, and

b) the directly identified additional information pages contain contents directly augment the contents of the retrieved information page being browsed.

In contrast, as pointed out in Applicant's last response, Niemi merely teaches the automatic augmentation of a retrieved information page with *queries* containing identified keywords as query parameters. See e.g. col. 5, lines 26-28, 32-34, 35-39, 42-43, 52-53, 59-60, 62-64 and so forth. Each of these queries include a "word number" of the keyword as the query parameter, word=29329 (for the keyword "Teamware"), word=34488 (for the keyword "Internet"), and so forth.

Each of the queries is ran individually *only on selection by a user*. See e.g. col. 6, lines 41-50, in particular, line 43, where Niemi states "By clicking ... on one of the <queries> ... the user causes the Web browser to request the <answer> of the <query> ..."

The execution of a user selected *query* results in a query against a keyword database, col. 6, lines 51-53. Assuming a match, the keyword database returns *a list of documents* (related to the original source document) containing the keywords, in the form of *links* to the *documents*, ranked by their similarities, col. 7, lines 14-17.

Only on selection of one of these *document links* by the user, the linked *document* is displayed, col. 7, lines 18-19.

Again, assuming arguendo that the display of a selected *linked document* in the answer set of a user selected *query* may be read as having "contents that directly augment the contents of the original page", the *links* to these *documents* are not automatically provided. The answer page containing these *links* is provided only upon selection of the *query* by a user.

Further, Applicant submits an answer page containing *links* to the similar *documents* is not "an information page with contents that directly augment the contents of the original page". Accordingly, the *queries* that can result in these answer pages are not "information source identifiers directly identifying additional information pages with second contents that may be additionally retrieved" where "the second contents directly augment the original content".

In response to Applicant's argument that Niemi merely teaches automatic augmentation of a retrieved information page with *queries*, the Examiner simply stated 'the Examiner disagrees", without providing any support for her reason for disagreement.

In response to Applicant's arguments that *links* to the ultimate content that augment the original page is *not* automatically provided, the Examiner points to Niemi's teaching on col. 6, lines 33-40. Applicant agrees with the Examiner that the referenced passage disclosed dynamic modification of the original information page on the fly. However, Applicant respectfully directs the Examiner's attention to the 70+ lines example preceding the reference passage, and the discussion immediately following the referenced page, which clearly show the modifications are augmentation of the information page with *queries*, not *information source identifiers directly identifying additional information pages* that may be retrieved, where *the additional information pages directly augment the original information page.*

To further illustrate, using the "Internet" keyword example immediately following the reference page. Under Niemi's scheme, the Internet keyword of the original information page is augmented with the *query "http:// ...word=29329 (stands for Internet) ...".* An answer page containing e.g. Answer Page {First link to Doc A {First info on Internet ..}, Second link to Doc B {Second info on Internet ...} ...} is returned only on selection of the *query. Doc A* {First info on Internet ...} is displayed only on selection of "First link to Doc A" by the user.

In contrast, the claim language requires the Internet keyword of the original information page be *automatically* augmented with a *link* such as the "First link to Doc A" that *directly* point the an information page *Doc A* with content {First info on Internet ..} that *directly* augments "Internet" of the original information page.

The Examiner's response further points to col. 5, lines 8-15, to support the assertion that Niemi's teaching of the answer page can be read as "information

source identifiers directly identifying additional information pages with second contents that may be additionally retrieved", where "the second contents directly augment the original content". As the Examiner noted the referenced passage discloses a text analysis function. However, the result of the analysis is the 70+ lines example spanning col. 5 and 6, where the web page is augmented with *queries* that result in *answer pages containing links to documents having information that augment the original page*.

So under Niemi, the "second contents" are *First link to Doc A {First augmentation information}, Second link to Doc B {Second augmentation information} etc.* Given Niemi's "second contents" are merely *links to documents*, they do not directly augment the first content (original information page). Again using the Internet keyword example, *First link to Doc A {First Internet augmentation information}, Second link to Doc B {Second Internet augmentation information} and so forth,* do not directly augment the keyword *Internet.*

Thus, for at least the above reasons, Niemi cannot be read as having anticipated the above enumerated required limitations. Therefore, claims 1, 21, 25, 35 and 39 are patentable over Neimi under 102(e).

Claims 2, 6-11, 22, 26-27, 36-37 and 40-41 depend on claims 1, 21, 25, 35 and 39, incorporating their limitations, respectively, therefore, for at least the same reasons, claims 2, 6-11, 22, 26-27, 36-37 and 40-41 are patentable over Niemi under 102(e).

With respect to claim 18, the Examiner did not address Applicant's arguments at all. Again, claim 18 is directed towards a method practiced on a server, requiring the server to receive from the client system *related keywords of keywords present in an information page being browsed*, and provide information

source identifiers identifying additional information pages that may be additionally retrieved based on these *related keywords of keywords present in an information page being browsed*, enabling the original information page to be automatically augmented with such information source identifiers (i.e. identifiers that identify additional information page based on the related keywords of keywords present in an information page being browsed).

As an example, assume the keywords "TCP/IP" and "HTTP" are considered related keywords to the keyword "Internet", the limitation requires the server method to include *receiving from the client system the example related keywords "TCP/IP" and "HTTP" from the client system* to allow the server to provide the client system with information source identifiers identifying information pages based on the related keywords "TCP/IP" and "HTTP", enabling the original information page (containing the keyword :Internet") to be automatically augmented with these information source identifiers (identifying information pages selected based on the related keywords "TCP/IP" and "HTTP").

As discussed earlier Neimi merely teaches the automatic augmentation of the original information page with *queries* having the present keywords (e.g. "Internet") as query parameters. It takes a user's selection of the *query* containing the "Internet" query parameter to cause the *answer page* containing *links* to similar pages to be presented to the user. Even if we assume such an answer page would contain links to information page with information on "TCP/IP" and "HTTP", these *links* are nonetheless not automatically provided from the client to the server, to allow the server to provide the client with automatic augmentation for the keyword "Internet".

Therefore, Neimi does not anticipate the required limitations of claim 18. Thus, claim 18 is patentable over Neimi under 102(e).

With respect to claim 30, the Examiner's response addressed only the secondary aspect of Applicant's argument, missing the primary reason of patentability which is Niemi failed to teach having the client system providing to the server the *location information* of the information page the client system is retrieving. [For the benefit of the Examiner, the reason of the above required limitation, as explained in the specification, is to allow the server to independently retrieve a copy of the information page, use this independently retrieved information page to determine the augmentation to be automatically to the client system.]

No such teachings of the client system providing the server with *location information* on what the client system is retrieving, exist in Niemi. Therefore, claim 30 is patentable over Neimi under 102(e).

Claims 31-32 depend on claims 30, incorporating its limitations, therefore, for at least the same reasons, claims 31-32 are patentable over Neimi under 102(e).

In summary, for reasons stated above, claims 1, 2, 6-11, 18, 21-22, 25-27, 30-32, 35-37 and 39-41 are patentable over Niemi under 35 USC 102(e).

Rejection of claims 3- 5

In the subject final office action, the Examiner maintained her rejections against claims 3 and 5 under 35 USC 103 for being obvious in view of Rubinstein et al (USP 5,913,215). Rubenstein does not cure the above discussed deficiency of Niemi, therefore claim 1 is patentable over Niemi even when combined with Rubenstein. Claims 3-5 depend on claim 1, incorporating its limitations, therefore, for at least the same reasons, claims 3-5 are patentable over Niemi and Rubenstein combined.

Rejection of claims 12-17, 19-20, 23-24, 28-29, 33-34, 38 and 42

In the subject final office action, the Examiner maintained her rejections against claims 12-17, 19-20, 23-24, 28-29, 33-34, 38 and 42 under 35 USC 103 for being obvious in view of Niemi and Finseth combined.

Claim 15 contains in substance the same limitations of claim 18. Therefore, for at least the same reasons, claim 15 is patentable over Niemei.

Finseth does not remedy the above discussed deficiency of Niemi, accordingly, claims 11, 15, 18, 21, 25, 30, 35 and 39 remain patentable over Niemi, even when combined with Finseth.

Claims 12-14, 16-17, 19-20, 23-24, 28-29, 33-34, 38 and 42 depend on claims 11, 15, 18, 21, 25, 30, 35 and 39, incorporating their limitations, respectively, therefore, for at least the same reasons claims 12-14, 16-17, 19-20, 23-24, 28-29, 33-34, 38 and 42 are patentable over Niemi and Finseth combined.

Conclusion

In view of the foregoing, Applicant respectfully submits that claims 1-42 are in condition for allowance, and early issuance of the Notice of Allowance is respectfully requested.

Please charge any shortages and credit any overages to Deposit Account No. 500393.

Respectfully submitted,
Schwabe, Williamson and Wyatt, P.C.

Date: July 9, 2004

Aloysius AuYeung
Reg. No. 35,432